

Exhibit A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In re ORACLE CORPORATION DERIVATIVE
LITIGATION

SCOTT OZAKI, derivatively and on behalf of
ORACLE CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAWRENCE J. ELLISON, SAFRA A. CATZ,
JEFFREY O. HENLEY, MICHAEL J. BOSKIN,
H. RAYMOND BINGHAM, DONALD L.
LUCAS, JEFFREY S. BERG, BRUCE R.
CHIZEN, HECTOR GARCIA-MOLINA, NAOMI
O. SELIGMAN, and GEORGE H. CONRADES,

Defendants,

-and-

ORACLE CORPORATION, a Delaware
Corporation,

Nominal Defendant.

Master File No. C-10-03392-RS;
Case No. C 11-04493-RS

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED
SETTLEMENT**

1 **TO: ALL CURRENT RECORD HOLDERS AND BENEFICIAL OWNERS OF**
2 **COMMON STOCK OF ORACLE CORPORATION ("ORACLE" OR THE**
3 **"COMPANY") AS OF _____, 2013 (date of preliminary approval)**
4 **("CURRENT ORACLE SHAREHOLDERS").**

5 **PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY AND IN ITS ENTIRETY. THIS**
6 **NOTICE RELATES TO A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND DISMISSAL OF**
7 **THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE ACTIONS, AND**
8 **CONTAINS IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS. IF**
9 **YOUR RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED BY THESE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS. IF**
10 **THE COURT APPROVES THE SETTLEMENT, YOU WILL BE FOREVER**
11 **BARRED FROM CONTESTING THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED**
12 **SETTLEMENT AND FROM PURSUING THE RELEASED CLAIMS.**

13 **IF YOU HOLD ORACLE COMMON STOCK FOR THE BENEFIT OF**
14 **ANOTHER, PLEASE PROMPTLY TRANSMIT THIS NOTICE TO SUCH**
15 **BENEFICIAL OWNER. THE COURT HAS MADE NO FINDINGS OR**
16 **DETERMINATIONS CONCERNING THE MERITS OF THESE ACTIONS. THE**
17 **RECITATION OF THE BACKGROUND AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE**
18 **SETTLEMENT CONTAINED HEREIN DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE**
19 **FINDINGS OF THE COURT. IT IS BASED ON REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO**
20 **THE COURT BY COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES.**

21 Notice is hereby provided to you of the proposed settlement (the "Settlement") of two
22 shareholder derivative actions: (1) *In re Oracle Corporation Derivative Litigation*, Master File
23 No. C-10-03392-RS (N.D. Cal.); and (2) *Ozaki v. Ellison, et al.*, Case No. C 11-04493-RS (N.D.
24 Cal.) (collectively, the "Derivative Actions"). This Notice is provided to you by Order of the
25 United States District Court for the Northern District of California (the "Court"). It is not an
26 expression of any opinion by the Federal Court. The purpose of this Notice is to notify you of the
27 terms of the proposed Settlement, and of your rights related thereto.

28 **I. WHY THE COMPANY HAS ISSUED THIS NOTICE**

Your rights may be affected by the settlement of the Derivative Actions. The plaintiffs in
those actions (Lisa Galaviz, Philip T. Prince, and Scott Ozaki (collectively referred to as the
"Plaintiffs")), defendants Jeffrey S. Berg, H. Raymond Bingham, Michael J. Boskin, Safra A.
Catz, Bruce R. Chizen, George H. Conrades, Lawrence J. Ellison, Hector Garcia-Molina, Jeffrey
O. Henley, Donald L. Lucas, Charles E. Phillips, Jr., and Naomi O. Seligman (collectively
referred to as the "Individual Defendants"), and nominal defendant Oracle (Oracle and the

1 Individual Defendants are collectively referred to as the “Defendants”) have agreed upon terms to
2 settle the Derivative Actions and have signed a written Stipulation of Settlement (the
3 “Stipulation”) setting forth those settlement terms.

4 On _____, 2013, at _____.m., the Court will hold a hearing (the “Settlement
5 Hearing”) in the Derivative Actions. The purpose of the Settlement Hearing is to determine:
6 (i) whether the terms of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and should be approved;
7 (ii) whether final judgments should be entered; and (iii) such other matters as may be necessary or
8 proper under the circumstances.

9 **II. SUMMARY OF THE LITIGATION**

10 **A. Procedural Overview**

11 **(i) The Consolidated Action**

12 On August 2, 2010, Plaintiff Lisa Galaviz filed a derivative complaint in the United States
13 District Court for the Northern District of California against Oracle (as a nominal defendant) and
14 certain of Oracle’s current and former officers and directors. On August 19, 2010, Plaintiff Philip
15 T. Prince filed a similar derivative complaint in the San Mateo Superior Court, which Defendants
16 removed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. On
17 February 8, 2011, the actions brought by Ms. Galaviz and Mr. Prince were ordered consolidated
18 for all purposes (the “Consolidated Action”). On February 10, 2011, the plaintiffs in the
19 Consolidated Action filed a consolidated complaint alleging the following claims for relief:
20 breach of fiduciary duty; abuse of control; and unjust enrichment based on violations of the False
21 Claims Act by Oracle.

22 On March 31, 2011, Oracle filed a motion to dismiss the Consolidated Action on the
23 ground that plaintiffs had failed to plead particularized facts demonstrating that they were
24 excused from making a demand upon Oracle’s Board of Directors to act on their allegations,
25 which was heard on June 2, 2011. The individual defendants in the Consolidated Action also
26 moved to dismiss that Action for failure to state a claim.

27 On September 12, 2011, the plaintiffs in the Consolidated Action filed a petition for a writ
28 of mandate in the California Superior Court for the County of San Mateo. The petition sought an

1 order under California Corporations Code Section 1601 compelling Oracle to allow inspection of
2 12 categories of documents. The stated purposes of the petition were to assist the plaintiffs in the
3 Consolidated Action in pleading demand futility, and to assist them in investigating the
4 allegations raised in that action.

5 On November 9, 2011, the Court issued an order granting Oracle's motion to dismiss the
6 Consolidated Action with leave to amend. The order held that, to demonstrate that demand would
7 have been futile, any amended complaint would have to plead particularized facts showing that
8 "the [Oracle] directors knew of, or recklessly disregarded" information showing that "Oracle was
9 engaged in the alleged wrongdoing." The Court also dismissed the Consolidated Action with
10 leave to amend on the independent ground that Plaintiffs had failed to demonstrate that they had
11 been Oracle shareholders at the time of the alleged wrongful acts and that they retained ownership
12 for the duration of the lawsuit.

13 The plaintiffs in the Consolidated Action have not yet filed an amended complaint. The
14 action has been stayed pending settlement negotiations pursuant to the parties' stipulation.

15 On December 12, 2011, the trial court in the Section 1601 Action entered final judgment
16 allowing the document inspection sought by the plaintiffs in the Consolidated Action. Oracle has
17 appealed that judgment and filed its opening brief on December 28, 2012. No hearing date has
18 been scheduled.

19 **(ii) The Ozaki Action**

20 On September 8, 2011, Plaintiff Scott Ozaki filed a derivative action (the "Ozaki Action")
21 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against some of the
22 same defendants named in the Consolidated Action. Mr. Ozaki's complaint asserted the
23 following claims for relief: breach of fiduciary duty; waste of corporate assets; and unjust
24 enrichment arising from allegations similar to those in the Consolidated Action. On April 9,
25 2012, the Ozaki Action was stayed pursuant to the parties' stipulation pending settlement
26 negotiations.

1 **(iii) The Dismissed Delaware Action**

2 On March 22, 2011, Plaintiff Jordan Weinrib filed a derivative action in the Court of
3 Chancery for the State of Delaware. That action was entitled *Weinrib v. Ellison, et al.*, Case No.
4 7350 (Del. Ch.) (the "Delaware Action"). Mr. Weinrib alleged claims for breach of fiduciary
5 duty based on allegations similar to those in the Consolidated Action. Mr. Weinrib voluntarily
6 dismissed his complaint without prejudice in April 2012, and the Delaware Action is no longer
7 pending.

8 **B. Settlement Negotiations**

9 The parties in the Consolidated Action and the Ozaki Action agreed to stay those actions
10 to facilitate settlement discussions. Those discussions began with a formal mediation on June 5,
11 2012, supervised by the Hon. Dickran M. Tevrizian (Ret.). Between June 2012 and December
12 2012, the parties continued their settlement discussions, including further telephonic conferences
13 with Judge Tevrizian and face-to-face and telephonic meetings between counsel.

14 Substantially in response to those discussions, and as set forth in further detail below,
15 Oracle has agreed to institute or maintain corporate governance provisions governing its internal
16 controls and systems regarding compliance with the False Claims Act and with regulations
17 promulgated by the General Services Administration regarding pricing for software licensed and
18 services provided to government agencies. After negotiating and reaching agreement on the
19 corporate governance provisions, the parties then subsequently began negotiations about the
20 payment of Derivative Plaintiffs' Counsel's fees and reimbursement of expenses. After
21 discussions with Judge Tevrizian and counsel, the parties eventually reached an agreement,
22 subject to Court approval, on payment to Derivative Plaintiffs' counsel for fees and expenses.

23 The Settling Parties believe that a settlement at this juncture on the terms and conditions
24 set forth herein is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of Oracle and its
25 shareholders.

26 **III. TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT**

27 The principal terms, conditions, and other matters that are part of the Settlement, which
28 are subject to approval by the Court, are summarized below. This summary should be read in

1 conjunction with, and is qualified in its entirety by reference to, the text of the Stipulation, which
2 has been filed with the Court and is available for public inspection. To fully, finally, and forever
3 resolve the Derivative Actions, and following extensive, arm's-length settlement negotiations, the
4 parties have agreed as set forth in the Stipulation as follows:

5 1. Oracle will continue or will implement certain corporate governance measures at
6 the Company, which include internal controls and procedures specifically relating to the
7 allegations raised in the Derivative Actions, including compliance with the False Claims Act and
8 with regulations promulgated by the General Services Administration (the "Corporate
9 Governance Measures") regarding pricing for software licensed and services provided to
10 government agencies. Oracle and the Individual Defendants acknowledge that the
11 implementation or continuation of these measures confers a benefit to the Company and is
12 substantially in response to the efforts of Plaintiffs' counsel in the Derivative Actions.

13 2. The Stipulation also provides for the entry of judgments dismissing the Derivative
14 Actions against Oracle and the Individual Defendants with prejudice and, as explained in more
15 detail in the Stipulation, barring and releasing certain known or unknown claims that have been or
16 could have been brought in any court by the Plaintiffs, by Oracle, or by any of its shareholders,
17 against Oracle and the Individual Defendants relating to any of the claims or matters that were or
18 could have been alleged or asserted in any of the pleadings or papers filed in the Derivative
19 Actions. The Stipulation further provides that the entry of Judgments will bar and release any
20 known or unknown claims that have been or could have been brought in any court by the
21 Defendants against Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' counsel related to any of the claims or matters that
22 were or could have been alleged or asserted in any of the pleadings or papers filed in the
23 Derivative Actions or based upon or arising out of the institution, prosecution, assertion,
24 settlement, or resolution of the Derivative Actions.

25 **IV. PLAINTIFFS' ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES**

26 After negotiating the substance of the Corporate Governance Measures described above,
27 the parties engaged in arm's-length negotiations regarding the attorneys' fees and expenses of
28 Plaintiffs' counsel. As a result of these negotiations, the parties have agreed that, subject to court

determination, the Company will pay or cause to be paid to Plaintiffs' counsel attorneys' fees and expenses in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1,900,000 (the "Fee Award"), for both of the Derivative Actions and for the Delaware Action. The Fee Award includes fees and expenses incurred by Plaintiffs' counsel in connection with the Derivative Actions and the Delaware Action. To date, Plaintiffs' counsel have not received any payment for their efforts in those actions. The Fee Award will compensate Plaintiffs' counsel for the results achieved in the Derivative Actions and the Delaware Action, and for undertaking the prosecution of those actions on a contingent basis.

V. REASONS FOR THE SETTLEMENT

Counsel for the parties believe that Settlement is in the best interests of Oracle and the Current Oracle Shareholders.

A. Why Did the Plaintiffs Agree to Settle?

Plaintiffs' counsel conducted an extensive investigation relating to the claims and the underlying events and transactions alleged in the Derivative Actions. Plaintiffs' Counsel have analyzed the evidence adduced during their investigation, and have researched the applicable law with respect to the potential claims of Plaintiffs, Oracle, and Current Oracle Shareholders against the Defendants, as well as the potential defenses thereto.

Based upon the investigation and analysis described above, Plaintiffs and their counsel have concluded that the terms and conditions of the Stipulation are fair, reasonable, and adequate to Plaintiffs, Oracle, and Current Oracle Shareholders, and in their best interests, and have agreed to settle the claims raised in the Derivative Actions pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Stipulation after considering, among other things: (i) the substantial benefits that Oracle and Current Oracle Shareholders have received or will receive from the Settlement; (ii) the attendant risks of continued litigation of the Derivative Actions; and (iii) the desirability of permitting the Settlement to be consummated.

In particular, Plaintiffs and their counsel considered the significant litigation risk inherent in the Derivative Actions. The law imposes significant burdens on plaintiffs for pleading and proving a shareholder derivative claim. While Plaintiffs believe their claims are meritorious,

1 Plaintiffs acknowledge that there is a substantial risk that the Derivative Actions may not succeed
2 in producing a recovery in light of the applicable legal standards and possible defenses. In fact,
3 the Court previously granted Oracle's motion to dismiss the complaint in one of the Derivative
4 Actions (with leave to amend), and there existed the possibility that, upon the Defendants'
5 motion, the Court would dismiss with prejudice any amended complaint. Plaintiffs and their
6 counsel believe that, under the circumstances, they have obtained the best possible relief for
7 Oracle and for Current Oracle Shareholders.

8 **B. Why Did the Defendants Agree to Settle?**

9 The Defendants have strenuously denied and continue to deny each and every allegation
10 of wrongdoing or liability that has been made against them or that could have been made against
11 them in the Derivative Actions. The Defendants have further asserted that, at all times, they acted
12 in good faith, and in a manner that they reasonably believed to be and that was in the best
13 interests of Oracle and Current Oracle Shareholders. The Defendants assert that they have
14 meritorious defenses to the claims in the Derivative Actions, and that judgment should be entered
15 dismissing all claims against them with prejudice. Nonetheless, the Defendants have entered into
16 the Stipulation solely to avoid the continuing additional expense, inconvenience, and distraction
17 of this burdensome litigation and to avoid the potential risks inherent in any lawsuit, and without
18 admitting any wrongdoing or liability whatsoever.

19 **VI. FINAL COURT HEARING REGARDING THE SETTLEMENT**

20 On _____, 2013, at _____.m., the Court will hold the Settlement Hearing at the
21 United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Phillip Burton Federal
22 Building and United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. At
23 the Settlement Hearing, the Court will consider whether the terms of the Settlement are fair,
24 reasonable, and adequate and thus should be finally approved and whether the Derivative Actions
25 should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the Stipulation.

26 **VII. YOUR RIGHT TO ATTEND THE SETTLEMENT HEARING**

27 Any Current Oracle Shareholder may, but is not required to, appear in person at the
28 Settlement Hearing. *Current Oracle Shareholders who have no objection to the Settlement do*

1 ***not need to appear at the Settlement Hearing or take any other action.*** If you want to be heard
2 at the Settlement Hearing, then you must comply with the procedures for objecting, which are set
3 forth below.

4 The Court has the right to change the date or time of the Settlement Hearing without
5 further notice. Thus, if you are planning to attend the Settlement Hearing, you should confirm the
6 date and time before going to the Court.

7 **VIII. YOUR RIGHT TO OBJECT AND PROCEDURES FOR DOING SO**

8 You have the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement. You must object in writing,
9 and you may request to be heard at the Settlement Hearing. ***If you choose to object, then you***
10 ***must comply with the following procedures.***

11 **A. You Must Make Detailed Objections in Writing**

12 Any objections must be submitted in writing and must contain the following information:

- 13 1. your name, legal address, and telephone number;
- 14 2. proof of your being a Current Oracle Shareholder as of _____, 2013 (date of
15 preliminary approval);
- 16 3. the date(s) that you acquired your Oracle shares;
- 17 4. a detailed statement of your specific position with respect to the matters to be
18 heard at the Settlement Hearing, including a statement of each objection being made;
- 19 5. the grounds for each objection or the reasons for your desiring to appear and to be
20 heard;
- 21 6. notice of whether you intend to appear at the Settlement Hearing (this is not
22 required if you have lodged your objection with the Court; and
- 23 7. copies of any papers you intend to submit to the Court, along with the names of
24 any witness(es) you intend to call to testify at the Settlement Hearing and the subject(s) of their
25 testimony.

26 The Court will not consider any objection that does not substantially comply with the
27 above requirements.
28

1 **B. You Must Timely Deliver Written Objections to the Court, Plaintiffs'**
2 **Counsel, and Defendants' Counsel**

3 ***YOUR WRITTEN OBJECTIONS MUST BE ON FILE WITH THE CLERK OF THE***
4 ***COURT NO LATER THAN _____, 2013.*** The Clerk's address is:

5 Clerk of the Court
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8 Phillip Burton Federal Building and United States Courthouse
9 450 Golden Gate Avenue
10 San Francisco, CA 94102

11 ***YOU MUST ALSO DELIVER COPIES OF THE MATERIALS TO PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL***
12 ***AND DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL SO THEY ARE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN _____***
13 ***_____, 2013.*** Counsel's addresses are:

14 Mark C. Molumphy
15 COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP
16 San Francisco Airport Office Center
17 840 Malcolm Road, Ste. 200
18 Burlingame, CA 94010

19 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

20 Jordan Eth
21 Philip T. Besirof
22 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
23 425 Market Street
24 San Francisco, CA 94105

25 *Counsel for Nominal Defendant Oracle and the Individual*
26 *Defendants*

27 The Court will not consider any objection that is not timely filed with the Court or not
28 timely delivered to Plaintiffs' counsel and Defendants' counsel. Any Person or entity who fails to
 object or otherwise request to be heard in the manner prescribed above will be deemed to have
 waived the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement (including the right to appeal) or to
 request to be heard at the Settlement Hearing, and will be forever barred from raising such
 objection or request in this or any other related action or proceeding.

29 **IX. HOW TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

30 This Notice summarizes the Stipulation. It is not a complete statement of the Stipulation
31 or of the events in the Derivative Actions. You may inspect the Stipulation and other papers filed

1 in the Derivative Actions at the United States District Clerk's office at any time during regular
2 business hours of each business day. The Clerk's office is located at the Phillip Burton Federal
3 Building and United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.
4 However, you must appear in person to inspect those documents. The Clerk's office will not mail
5 copies to you. You may also contact a representative of Plaintiffs' counsel, Mark C. Molumphy,
6 Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP, San Francisco Airport Office Center, 840 Malcolm Road, Suite
7 200, Burlingame, CA 94010, telephone (650) 697-6000.

8 ***PLEASE DO NOT CALL, WRITE, OR OTHERWISE DIRECT QUESTIONS ABOUT***
9 ***THIS NOTICE, THE SETTLEMENT, OR THE DERIVATIVE ACTIONS TO EITHER THE***
10 ***COURT OR THE CLERK'S OFFICE.*** Any questions you have about matters in this Notice
11 should be directed by telephone or in writing to Plaintiffs' counsel, at the address set forth above.
12

13
14 DATED: _____, 2013

BY ORDER OF THE COURT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 In re ORACLE CORPORATION DERIVATIVE
4 LITIGATION

5 SCOTT OZAKI, derivatively and on behalf of
6 ORACLE CORPORATION,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 LAWRENCE J. ELLISON, SAFRA A. CATZ,
10 JEFFREY O. HENLEY, MICHAEL J. BOSKIN,
11 H. RAYMOND BINGHAM, DONALD L.
12 LUCAS, JEFFREY S. BERG, BRUCE R.
13 CHIZEN, HECTOR GARCIA-MOLINA, NAOMI
14 O. SELIGMAN, and GEORGE H. CONRADES,

15 Defendants,

16 -and-

17 ORACLE CORPORATION, a Delaware
18 Corporation,

19 Nominal Defendant.

Master File No. C-10-03392-RS;
Case No. C 11-04493-RS

20 SUMMARY NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

21 TO: ALL CURRENT RECORD HOLDERS AND BENEFICIAL OWNERS OF COMMON
22 STOCK OF ORACLE CORPORATION ("ORACLE" OR THE "COMPANY") AS OF
23 _____, 2013 (date of preliminary approval) ("CURRENT ORACLE
24 SHAREHOLDERS").

25 This notice relates to a proposed settlement and dismissal of the above-captioned
26 shareholder derivative actions (the "Derivative Actions"), which were brought on behalf of
27 Oracle, and contains important information regarding your rights. Your rights may be affected by
28 these legal proceedings. If the Court approves the settlement as set forth in a Stipulation of
Settlement ("Stipulation"), you will be forever barred from contesting the approval of the

1 proposed settlement and from pursuing the released claims. The proposed settlement does not
2 provide for monetary recovery. Accordingly, there is no claim form.

3 A hearing to determine whether the proposed settlement of the claims that were asserted
4 by Derivative Plaintiffs on behalf of Oracle, against certain directors and officers of Oracle
5 should be approved by the Court as fair, reasonable, and adequate will be held on _____,
6 2013, at _____.m. before the Honorable Richard Seeborg, United States District Judge, at the
7 United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Phillip Burton Federal
8 Building and United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. At
9 the hearing, the Court will also consider whether to enter a judgment dismissing all claims in the
10 litigation with prejudice, forever discharging and settling certain released claims, whether to
11 approve Derivative Plaintiffs' Counsel's fees and expenses, and any other matters that may be
12 properly before the Court in connection with the Stipulation and proposed settlement.

13 THIS NOTICE IS A SUMMARY ONLY AND DOES NOT DESCRIBE ALL THE
14 DETAILS OF THE STIPULATION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT. Nothing in this notice
15 varies or supersedes the terms of the Stipulation. For full details of the matters discussed in this
16 summary, you may review the Stipulation filed with the Court or a more detailed notice regarding
17 the terms of the proposed settlement ("Notice of Proposed Settlement"). You may inspect the
18 Stipulation and other papers filed in the Derivative Actions at the United States District Clerk's
19 office at any time during regular business hours of each business day, at the address set forth
20 above. You also may review the Stipulation and Notice of Proposed Settlement on Oracle's
21 website at <http://www.oracle.com/us/corporate/investor-relations/index.html>. You also may
22 request the Stipulation and Notice of Proposed Settlement from Derivative Plaintiffs' Counsel:

23 Mark C. Molumphy
24 Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP
25 San Francisco Airport Office Center
26 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
Burlingame, CA 94010
Tel: (650) 697-6000

27 You are encouraged to review the Notice of Proposed Settlement and the Stipulation. PLEASE
28 DO NOT CALL, WRITE, OR OTHERWISE DIRECT QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS MATTER

1 TO EITHER THE COURT OR THE CLERK'S OFFICE. Instead, any questions should be
2 directed by telephone or in writing to Derivative Plaintiffs' Counsel.

3 You may, but are not required to, appear in person at the Settlement Hearing. If you want
4 to be heard at the Settlement Hearing, then you must comply with the procedures for objecting,
5 which are set forth in the Notice of Proposed Settlement, on or before _____, 2013.

6 Current Oracle Shareholders who have no objection to the Settlement do not need to
7 appear at the Settlement Hearing or take any other action. If you do not take steps to appear in
8 these actions and object to the proposed settlement, you will be bound by the final judgment of
9 the Court and will forever be barred from raising an objection to such settlement in this or any
10 other action or proceeding, and from pursuing any of the released claims.

11
12 DATED: _____, 2013

13 BY ORDER OF THE COURT
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28